DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 726 FL 002 375

AUTHOR Womack, Thurston
TITLE Preparing Teachers for TESOL--Where We've Been, Where We Are, and Maybe Where We Should Be Going.
PUB DATE 6 Mar 71
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the Fifth Annual TESOL Convention, March 6, 1971, New Orleans, Louisiana

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education, Curriculum Design, Degree Requirements, Degrees (Titles), *English (Second Language), English Departments, Graduate Students, Higher Education, *Language Programs, *Masters Degrees, *Modern Language Curriculum, Second Language Learning, *Teacher Education, Universities
IDENTIFIERS *San Francisco State College

ABSTRACT

The number of M. A. programs for preparing TESOL teachers has grown greatly in the past decade. The profession generally has grown and matured during this period. The M. A. program at San Francisco State College was established in 1963 and has graduated over a hundred teachers. A number of developments, particularly in general linguistic theory, in language acquisition and bilingualism, and in social dialects, have affected the profession significantly. The program at San Francisco State, so far as its array of course work and requirements is concerned, appears to have changed little since its beginning. Yet adjustments have been made because of the accumulated experience of the staff, changes in the local population of non-English speakers, and developments in the profession generally. This paper attempts to describe and evaluate the San Francisco program by considering where it has been, where it is, and where it might be going. (Author)

FL 002 375

ED051726

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Thurston Womack
San Francisco State College

Preparing Teachers for TESOL-- Where We've Been, Where We Are, and Maybe Where We Should Be Going

I feel, after about ten years with a TESOL teacher training program, almost a compulsion to make a public statement about it. (I won't engage in a discussion of training versus education. We've all been through that, I think. If I use the term training, I mean both training and education as they are usually defined. I hope we've both educated and trained our students.) We've had EFL at San Francisco State College since about 1950. In the late fifties we started talking about some kind of teacher training program. A member of our staff planned and taught a methods course. Those of us concerned with EFL were in one way or another Michigan or TC-Columbia trained. There was little or nothing taught in the way of linguistics, except history of the English language, when I arrived in 1954. In a couple of years I managed to get two courses underway, Introduction to the Study of Language, and Modern English Grammar, neither oriented toward TESOL teachers.

In 1963 we got a variant of the M.A. in English approved. It was designated "M.A. in English with a concentration in English as a foreign language." The word teaching was deleted because the college graduate committee thought we might be intruding on the domain of the school of education. Perhaps we might have. Perhaps we should have. Perhaps we have intruded. I'm not sure. At any rate, the school of education has never complained. For many reasons, probably. For one thing we have never had anything much to do with certification-- and that is something we should be collaborating on at the present time. I'll come back to this point.

FL002375

To my knowledge the only other institution in the West offering a TESOL teacher-training program at that time was the University of California at Los Angeles, and that was a certificate program, not an M.A. program. We felt bold and also a bit uneasy about offering an M.A. when mighty UCLA apparently felt content to stick to a certificate. Our program was hardly innovative. Our strategy for getting it approved was that it was like programs at famous places like Michigan and Columbia. Also we had to set the program up without inaugurating a large number of new courses.

Essentially the program assumed an undergraduate major in English which hopefully included such courses as introductory linguistics, structure of English and history of the English language. The graduate program was a minimum of 30 units distributed over three semesters and included 18 units of professional courses: introduction to graduate study in TESOL; seminar in methodology; student teaching; materials preparation; seminar in English grammars; and reading for the comprehensive written and oral examination. An additional course was required in literature, one in cultural anthropology, one in education or psychology, plus an elective to make up the 30 units. One foreign language was required and if the student offered an Indo-European language, at least a one-semester course or the equivalent was required in a non-Indo-European language--"to prevent linguistic provincialism," we said in our statement of rationale. No thesis was required.

Our first graduate was a young Brazilian woman who had come to the campus with an International Teacher Development Program that we had going for several years. She went back to Brazil as chairman of a college English Department, subsequently met and married a young American and is now teaching Portugese and working on a Ph. D.in linguistics here in the States.

Since that time in 1963 and now we have graduated almost 150 additional TESOL M.A.'s. I am pleased to note that three of them, Donna Ilyin, Allan Sharp and Anne Terrell, have contributed to the program of this conference.

In the early sixties the profession was in its joyous infancy as an organizing if not organized profession. We told our students of the golden opportunities for employment, for travel abroad. Don't worry about jobs, we said. There are more than enough: you are in a sellers' market. As it has worked out, most of our graduates did not go abroad. Not all of them, we discovered, were adventurous types; indeed most of them wanted to remain in the San Francisco Bay Area, which admittedly, is a beautiful place to remain. Most of our graduates of the first five or six years have ended up in college or adult level teaching. In the first years there were many opportunities in California's extensive junior college system and in a variety of urban adult education programs. Looking back, I think it is perhaps possible to see that we, the staff, skewed the program in that direction. It was reasonable to do so. The jobs were there, attractive jobs with good salaries and decent working conditions. Neither we nor the students had to get involved in the troublesome matter of state certification.

Some of our graduates did leave the San Francisco Bay Area. I'm tempted to say: went as far south as Los Angeles, as far north as Seattle, as far east as Boise, for it is true that they did. But it is also true that we have graduates scattered around the world: Mexico, Europe, Turkey, Japan, and this does not include the twenty or so foreign students who have completed our program.

The focus, then was on preparation for college and adult level teaching. About three years or so ago our graduates began to have difficulty in finding jobs. At about the same time, the San Francisco Unified School District began to take steps to develop ESL and bilingual education programs, particularly designed to deal with the large Chinese and Spanish-speaking populations. Such developments were simultaneous with (perhaps a result of) the emergence of ethnic self-consciousness and pride among these and other ethnic groups. The ESL programs developed for the Chinese and Spanish-speaking communities, of course, needed suitable trained teachers. Since we had always considered our program general professional education in TESOL, we felt it

could produce such teachers, with some adjustments of courses dealing with methods and materials, and by making different student teaching assignments. Our student teaching assignments had mostly been made in our own English for foreign student courses or in the American Language Institute on our campus which offers intensive English to college-bound but unmatriculated foreign students.

But aside from the relatively few experienced teachers in our M.A. program, our students lacked the necessary state teaching credential to teach in the elementary or secondary schools. Our M.A. led to no credential. Those few who worked toward a credential, while also working for the M.A., found that the combined programs took at least two and a half years. Few students could or would invest to that extent in their preparation. We have discussed the dilemma with our colleagues in education and with authorities in the school district. Everyone agrees that we must manage with the least amount of bureaucratic interference to make our unemployed M.A. graduates available to the local schools.

So far we haven't gotten very far. Clouding the matter are the changing regulations for teacher certification in California. Complicating the matter is the growing insistence of the ethnic communities that bilingual-bicultural teachers be hired. Most of our graduates don't qualify, though some indeed do speak Spanish but are lacking Spanish surnames. Additionallly there is a curious anti-ESL feeling so that ESL is opposed to bilingual, in contrastive distribution, as it were. I have heard discussions about whether a particular program was to be bilingual or ESL. There have been numerous patient explanations that a bilingual program must by definition include an ESL component--but to little avail. This whole matter is in our laps right now. The future challenge is next week, next month, next year. Of course we are encouraging more Chinese and students with Spanish surnames to go into our program. But there remains those presently unemployed and those coming along, and there are just not enough bilingual-bicultural ESLers to go around.

For the first time since most of us on the staff have been in the profession--we are mostly middle-aged: late thirties to middle fifties -- we face the prospect of discouraging students from entering TESOL. We haven't actually consciously decided to do that, but we feel we must in good conscience at least speak of the hazards of the job situation in TESOL. It is the plight of all education it seems. Too many teachers. Too many teachers? Not so, say some. Teachers are needed; there is actually a teacher shortage but the public will not underwrite education further if it means additional taxes. All of us in education and in TESOL have felt the pinch. Our foreign student office was budgetarily eliminated last summer, as were all foreign student offices in the California State College system. We are wondering whether all special courses in English for foreign students will not soon be abolished.

Then there is the matter of Standard English as a Second Dialect (SESD). To what extent should our M.A.'s be competent to deal with the educational and linguistic complexities of that matter? We know that some of our graduates have jobs which involve such concerns. We therefore feel some responsibility for providing at least minimal exposure via course work. We do not have the resources of staff and budget to offer a parallel M.A. program or variant of it. We have been stimulated by Clifford Prator's "Proposed Modification of the TESL Certificate and M.A. Programs toProvide for Specialization in the Teaching of English To Disadvantaged Groups in American Schools" which appeared in volume four, June, 1970, of the UCLA workpapers. The program was to be inaugurated in the present academic year.

The University of California at Los Angeles' resources are vast in linguistics and TESL compared with ours, yet they live in the same state and have the same governor and legislature . . . . The best we have been able to do is hire a sociolinguist, who is presently teaching an upper division course in social dialects and hopes to have a graduate course going next year. We encourage our M.A. candidates to take the course as an elective. We will be unable to do any more until

budgetarily brighter days come to higher education in California. We hope we can hang on to what we already have.

Our program, like most, evolved in an English department, out of courses in English for foreign students. This is not universal, for there are examples of similar programs being offered by speech, linguistics, and education departments. And now we have at least one department of teaching English as a foreign language. In the spring of 1968 I visisted 12 British universities offering teacher training in TESOL. Most programs are offered in education departments, though at Reading it's offered by the linguistics department, at Edinburgh by the department of applied linguistics (since changed, I believe), and at Essex by the department of languages.

I mention these variations because our staff has considered from time to time the advisability of leaving the English department. We have not considered joining an existing department. Some have wanted a linguistics department and we have been encouraged by our colleagues in the anthropology department. But some of us have resisted this. We have not been training linguists, we say, but TESOL teachers. We should not compete with the University of California at Berkeley or Stanford University, who have not only M.A. but Ph.D. programs in linguistics--and we are not and cannot be in the Ph.D. business. And Berkeley and Stanford have no programs in teacher training in TESOL.

Besides, what can you do with an M.A. in linguistics? Linguistics is not accepted as a teaching major subject by the State of California. We have the case of the young man with an M.A. in linguistics from Berkeley who came to us and took a second M.A. in TESOL because he could find no employment with an M.A. in linguistics, except as a service station attendant.

What about a department of TEFL or EFL? I am an old English department hand myself and have taught literature, composition and freshman English and have help establish courses in stylistics and in linguistics and the teaching of English. And I find it difficult to think of the undergraduate curriculum, if any there should be, in a department of (teaching) English as a foreign language. The graduate curriculum, it seems to me, would be essentially what we have now. What is our unhappiness about being in an English department? First, we are a minority group in a big department. We are about ten in a staff

of 80. The department is primarily concerned with the teaching of literature, with quite secondary concerns with freshman English and composition. We are perhaps excessively aware of our colleagues' work and concerns and problems. Many of our colleagues are almost unaware of our existence. Most of them have little notion about what it is we do at all. We are "the linguists." "English as a Foreign or Second Language" seems to them an incomprehensible and barbaric collocation that we sometimes weary of explaining. The department hiring, retention, and tenure committee hires our people as well as theirs, but we generally manage to have representation on that committee. On tally, however, I'm glad we remain in the English department. I feel we benefit from close proximity to colleagues in literature and I think we have been good for them.

Most of what I've been talking about has been <u>outside</u> the program, or has been administrative or concerned with placement, or has been concerned with curriculum only in a general way. I'd now like to take a quick look inside the program. In the final semester of their program, our students take a seminar that is supposed to pull together, to integrate the more or less discrete course work and seminars they have been taking. Perhaps unfortunately the seminar is also a kind of preparation for the comprehensive written and oral examination coming up. We usually get the seminar underway by reading Wardhaugh's "The State of the Art" and the articles by Bolinger, Hanzelli, Bowen, Krohn, and others concerned with the relationship between linguistic theory and language teaching. We are also now reading Jacobovitz's <u>Foreign Language Learning</u>. I also toss in Aristotle Katranides' observation at last year's conference that language teaching should free itself from the influence of linguistics, as it has already freed itself from the influence of literature.

Katranides further stated that the main contribution of linguists was to burden language teaching with linguistic "fashion" and jargon. We ask our students to deal with Katranides' position. We go over the history of methodology and we review particularly audio-lingual methodology (how right it seemed when I was a graduate student!) and the questions that have been and are being raised about it. We cover, of course, a considerable array

of other topics, but these matters are probably the most disturbing and challenging to deal with. In fact there are no easy answers--if there are any answers at all. Students anticipating the examination want to know what "answers" could be given. I can respond that they can only discuss the questions in an informed and intelligent manner.

After last semester's crop had completed courses and exams, I asked them to respond anonymously to six questions:

1. What would you consider the three major focusses, preoccupations or concerns in TESOL at the present time?
2. What would you consider the major dilemma of the profession at the present time?
3. What published materials on TESOL or related fields you have read during your M.A. experience do you consider the most seminal, or to have had the most influence on your views?
4. What subject matter(s) in the M.A. program would you consider the most valuable in your preparation as a TESOL teacher?
5. How do you feel at present about your choice of TESOL as a profession? Would you choose it again if you had it all to do over?
6. What suggestions would you make to the TESOL staff for improving the present program?

There isn't time to go into their responses--and I keep reminding myself that these were students as yet largely unseasoned in the profession. I am planning to circulate a similar questionnaire to our [redacted] graduates now in the field, some with six or more years under their belts. The one response that was consistently the same on the limited response by largely inexperienced people was to number five, Would you choose TESOL as your profession if you had it to do all over again? They all said they would, in spite of the job market. At least our M.A. program hadn't driven them out of the profession! Whether the profession itself will do it remains to be seen.

or those forces that shape and control it